



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,271	11/30/2001	Alain Delpuch	OTV-1021-US	1037

44015 7590 04/20/2006

OPTV/MEYERTONS
THE CHASE BUILDING
700 LAVACA, SUITE 800
AUSTIN, TX 78701

EXAMINER

BROWN, RUEBEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/980,271		DELPUCH, ALAIN	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Reuben M. Brown		2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raduchel, (U.S. Pat # 6,338,138) in view of Patterson, (U.S. pat # 6,122,741).

Considering amended claim 1, the claimed system for authenticating a PIN code of a user in an interactive information system in order to run an application, comprising;

‘an input device for PIN entry’, is met by the input device 110 of Raduchel, col. 3, lines 55-60 & Fig. 1.

‘security manager configured to: receive a request for user authentication from the application’ is met by the disclosure in Raduchel that when a user attempts to access certain services using a browser (such as icons 502-506), to which the instant user is not already authenticated, the browser sends request to an authentication manger 128, to authenticate the instant user, see col. 5, lines 50-65. Thus, the claimed ‘application’ is broad enough to read on the browser or any of the services that the user seeks to access.

‘compare a received PIN code of user with a registered PIN code, in response to the request is met by the operation of the authentication manager 128, in conjunction with the authentication file 130, col. 3, lines 25-40 & col. 4, lines 9-25.

‘supply information to the application about PIN code entering key-pressing operations by the user, wherein the PIN code is not supplied to the application’ and ‘wherein the application is configured to present a PIN entry field, such that the crypted information corresponding to the information about the PIN code is displayed in the PIN entry field’, in Raduchel, when the user enters the log-in information, it is delivered directly to the authentication manager 128, which reads on the claimed subject matter, col. 5, lines 17-35. However Raduchel does not disclose that the user is presented with the PIN being hidden or crypted. Nevertheless Patterson, which is in the same field of endeavor discloses blocking from display the actual characters entered by the user, see Fig. 5. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to not allow the passwords to be shown, as disclosed by Patterson, for the

Art Unit: 2623

desirable improvement of keeping the subscriber's password confidential even if another person is in the room and observes the password being entered.

'give authorization to run the application if the PIN code of the user matches the registered PIN code', is also met by the operation of the authentication manger 128., see col. 3, lines 30-45.

Considering claims 2-3, 7-8 & 10-11, even though Raduchel does not disclose its use with a TV or mobile phone system, Official Notice is taken that the time the invention was made, it was well known in the art to use PIN or password security in a TV or mobile phone system. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a PIN or password feature in a TV or mobile phone system, at least for the desirable purpose of prohibiting unauthorized use of programming on those devices.

Considering claim 4, the claimed method for authenticating a PIN code of a user, comprising elements that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 1, are likewise treated.

Considering claim 9, the claimed computer readable medium comprising executable instructions for authenticating a PIN code of a user, comprising elements that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 1, are likewise treated.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- A) Gifford Teaches authentication of user using a challenge response to the client.
- B) Paskins Authentication using conditional access support separate from authenticating application, found in CASS module 4.
- C) Jones Authentication of multiple applications (i.e., providers) with a single PIN.
- D) Hashiguchi Authentication using manager, separate from application

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2623

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:


(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Reuben M. Brown


HAITRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER